The Sztokfisz Edition

# ערוך השולחן

לרבינו הגאון

**רבי יחיאל מיכל הלוי אפשטיין זצ"ל**

אב בית דין נאווהרדק

## אורח חיים

## הלכות לולב

סימנים תרמ"ה–תרס"ט · כרך ד'

# Aruch HaShulchan

*by Rabbi Yechiel Michel HaLevi Epstein*

*Av Beis Din of Novardok (1829–1908)*

Lulav — Vol. 4 — Orach Chaim 645–669

With interlinear translation, comparative halachah
from the Mishnah Berurah, Shulchan Aruch HaRav, and today's poskim.
Includes a practical summary of every siman

Kesser Shem Tov
PUBLISHING

**Aruch HaShulchan**

*Orach Chaim — The Festivals of the Year · Volume Four*

Kesser Shem Tov Publishing

www.kstpublishing.com

*The foundational Hebrew text utilized in this Kesser Shem Tov edition is sourced from the Sefaria database, with minor emendations by the editor to ensure textual accuracy.*

Copyright © 2026 Kesser Shem Tov Publishing

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other noncommercial uses permitted by copyright law.

First Kesser Shem Tov edition

Version 2.00

**ISBN:** 9798194801039

For inquiries and permissions: publisher@kstpublishing.com

# A NOTE ON METHODOLOGY

**The Nature of this Work**

This volume presents an original English elucidation and commentary, prepared through a combination of advanced language and translation technology and human editorial oversight. The methods employed were carefully configured to adhere to Orthodox Jewish *hashkafa* and to preserve fidelity to the original Hebrew text. Even so, this edition does not carry the authority of a translation prepared and certified by a full team of rabbinic scholars.

**Usage and Limitations**

This translation is intended as a tool to help advanced learners access the depth of the original work. It is **not** intended to replace the original Hebrew source, nor to serve as a substitute for study under a qualified teacher.

Because the nuance of Torah study often transcends any single method of preparation, we ask the reader to keep two things in mind:

1. **Verification:** Any novel insight, ruling, or conclusion drawn from this translation should be checked against the original Hebrew.
2. **Consultation:** All practical questions or derived lessons should be discussed with and verified by a qualified rabbinic authority before being relied upon.

The goal of this edition is to make these teachings accessible to a wider audience, but the responsibility for accurate understanding and practical application remains with the reader.

# לזכות

## ילדינו היקרים שיחיו

**אורי זלמן**
**דויד בערל**
**גולדה יוכבד**
**אהרן יעקוב**

יהי רצון שזכות הדפסת ספר זה תעמוד להם,
שיזכו לגדול לתורה לחופה ולמעשים טובים,
להמשיך במסורת אבותיהם,
ושיהיו דברי התורה תמיד מתוקים וערבים בפיהם.

הוקדש באהבה על ידי הוריהם

**אברהם כתריאל בן יטקע בעילה**
**חיקע לאה בת פעסי**
**שטוקפיש**

ס. פאולו, ברזיל

**AH:** The *Aruch HaShulchan* agrees that whitening is the test. For willows with large leaves, he specifically rejects the test of whether the leaves crumble under a fingernail.

**ודע שיש ליזהר כשתוחבין הערבות בהלולב, שלא יתלשו העלין ברוב אורך השיעור.** — **Know that one must be careful when inserting the willows into the lulav, that the leaves should not be torn off over the majority of the required length.**

## Halachic Divergences & Insights

**Leaves That Grow Only on Side Shoots**

***Shevet HaLevi 7:61; Teshuvos v'Hanhagos 2:313; Orchos Rabbeinu vol. 2 p. 256:*** A willow cut from a young tree may have small, leafy side shoots while the branch itself has no leaves along the three tefachim required for the mitzvah. *Shevet HaLevi* 7:61 and *Teshuvos v'Hanhagos* 2:313 rule that such a willow is valid. The requirement that leaves cover the wood applies to a hadas, not to a willow.

Nevertheless, because willows are readily available, both authorities prefer a willow with leaves growing directly on the branch. A branch with a number of such leaves is mehudar. The side shoots do not need to be removed. *Orchos Rabbeinu* vol. 2 p. 256 records that **R' Yaakov Yisrael Kanievsky** did not trim them, even within the three tefachim.

In places where willows begin sprouting only shortly before Sukkos, these leafless branches are common. The same authorities suggest pruning the tree about a month before Sukkos so that new branches will grow with leaves on the wood itself.

## Halachic Divergences & Insights

**Leaves that are split, torn, or pierced**

***Mishnah Berurah sk. 9; Orchos Chaim sk. 4, glosses of Maharsham, citing Daas Kedoshim; Zichron Avraham:*** The *Aruch HaShulchan* discusses willow leaves that have become dislodged from the stalk but remain attached. He treats them as if they had fallen. He treats split or divided leaves the same way when most of the leaves are affected. This ruling follows the *Maggid Mishneh* and the *Magen Avraham*. *Mishnah Berurah* sk. 9 cites the *Maggid Mishneh*. Dislodged, split, or divided leaves count as leaves that were torn away and invalidate the willow. This applies only when most of the leaves are affected. The *Magen Avraham* holds that one should be strin-

gent like the *Maggid Mishneh* because willows are easy to obtain. As a matter of strict law, however, such a willow is valid.

There is a separate rule for damage to an individual leaf. The willow is valid if only part of each leaf is missing. It is invalid if most of each leaf is missing and most of the leaves are affected. This rule appears in *Orchos Chaim* sk. 4, in the glosses of **Maharsham**, citing *Daas Kedoshim*.

*Zichron Avraham* discusses a rainy year in which willow leaves grow with holes. He rules that these leaves should not be disqualified. This implies that, l'chatchilah, a person should seek leaves that are whole and have no holes.

## Halachic Divergences & Insights

**Drooping Leaves and a Bent Willow Tip**

***Chazon Ish 146:35; Orchos Rabbeinu vol. 2 pp. 254-256:*** *Chazon Ish* 146:35 rules that leaves which have come loose and hang downward are invalid as a matter of law, because willows do not naturally grow that way.

A tip that bends over is different. It does not invalidate the willow, because willow tips naturally bend due to their softness. *Orchos Rabbeinu* vol. 2 pp. 254-256 records that the **Chazon Ish** did not insist that willow tops stand upright. It also records that **R' Yaakov Yisrael Kanievsky** said there is no need to be particular about this.

Nevertheless, **R' Yaakov Yisrael Kanievsky** was sometimes particular. He would either add a ring at the top to tie the bent willow to the lulav, or hold the willow upright while reciting the blessing.

## Halachic Divergences & Insights

**The Livlov at the Top of a Willow**

***Chaim uBerachah os 246; Kashrus Daled Minim p. 130; Mishnah Berurah sk. 11; Daled Minim HaShalem, Miluim to the laws of aravah os 2; Orchos Rabbeinu vol. 2 p. 253:*** The disqualification of a cut tip refers to the wood of the willow. A cut or broken top leaf does not invalidate it. Even if the livlov, the uppermost leaf that has begun to bud but has not fully opened, falls off entirely, the willow remains valid (*Chaim uBerachah* os 246; *Kashrus Daled Minim* p. 130). Strictly speaking, a livlov is not required. The willow may be used even *l'chatchilah* if it is clear that the wood at the top was not cut.

The widespread practice is to seek a willow with a livlov because it proves that the

wood was not cut. *Chaim uBerachah* gives another basis for this practice: the *Shiltei Giborim* (*Sukkah* 33b), cited by the *Bach*, says that the top leaf is essential to the willow's validity. *Daled Minim HaShalem* adds that the Meiri is stringent when the top leaf was cut. However, *Orchos Rabbeinu* vol. 2 p. 253 records that **R' Yaakov Yisrael Kanievsky** did not insist on a willow with a livlov.

*Mishnah Berurah* sk. 11 writes that because willows are easy to obtain, it is good *l'chatchilah* for no leaves to be missing along the three tefachim. This applies especially to the top leaf.

## תמצית ערוך השולחן

## Tamtzis Aruch HaShulchan

*The siman's dinim in brief — The Kosher Willow (Aravah)*

*From the Braitman Family Edition of the Tamtzis Aruch HaShulchan series, published by Kesser Shem Tov Press.*

### Identifying the Kosher Willow

The **aravah ("*arvei nachal*")** of the Torah is a specific species: its leaf is elongated like a stream, its edge is smooth, and its stem is red. (AH §1; Rambam, Hilchos Lulav, ch. 7) Most of this species grows by streams, hence "*arvei nachal*"; but even one grown in the desert or on the mountains is *kosher*. (AH §1)

**A similar species that is disqualified** is the *tzaftzafah*: its leaf is round, its edge is like a saw, and its stem is not red. (AH §1)

There is a type of *aravah* whose leaf-edge is not smooth, yet is not like a saw either, but has very tiny serrations like the edge of a small sickle — and this is *kosher*. (AH §1)

### The Leaf-Edge: Sickle Versus Saw

An edge resembling a **sickle (*magal*)** is *kosher*; one resembling a **saw (*masor*)** is disqualified. (AH §2; *Sukkah* 34a)

- According to Rambam the difference is one of size: sickle-like has small serrations, saw-like has large ones (with no defined measure given). (AH §2; Rambam)
- According to Rashi, Rosh, and the Tur the difference is in the shape: saw-like has notches running straight, each with two points on either side like a knife-notch, whereas sickle-like has all its notches leaning to one side, curved toward the handle. (AH §2; Rashi, Rosh, and Tur)

A leaf resembling a sickle is *kosher*, whether by Rambam's understanding or by Rashi and the Tur's — for in truth the serrations are not the essential factor in the *aravah*. (AH §4)

**As a practical matter,** any leaf whose serrations are not large to the eye, or that does not have the two-pointed notches, is not "resembling a saw" and is *kosher*. (AH §4; *Tosefta*, ch. 2)

### Our Two Common Varieties

Both common varieties have elongated leaves and reddish stems: one has larger, non-smooth leaves (sickle-like per Rashi and the Tur) with a very red stem; the other has small smooth leaves with a stem that is not reddish — and **both are kosher in law**. (AH §3)

**Even a green stem** is *kosher*, since it will eventually turn red when the sun shines on it. (AH §3; Rema)[1]

Some are particular to use the large-leaved variety for its redness; some are particular to use the small-leaved variety for its smoothness and because it is sturdier — the large leaves fall off frequently and dry out quickly. (AH §3)

### Place of Growth

An *aravah* is *kosher* whether it grew by the water, in a valley or plain, on the mountains, or in a field watered only by rain or by hand — the species is what matters, not the location. (AH §7; *Sukkah* 34a)

**Contrary to a stringent view,** there is no preference or extra *mitzvah min hamuvchar* for willows that grow by the water, and the widespread practice is not to seek this out. (AH §5; Rosh)[2]

### Disqualifications and Damage

**If most of the leaves dried out, or most fell off, or the top of the branch was severed** — it is disqualified. (AH §8)[3]

- Rambam holds that a severed top is *kosher* in an *aravah* just as in a *hadas*, and one may rely on him when no other is available. (AH §8; Rambam)[4]

**If a berry-like growth (*tamrah*) came up on it** — it is *kosher*, as with a *hadas*. (AH §8; Eliyahu Rabbah)[5]

**If the leaves were detached from the stem (*nifretzu*)** — dangling loose though still attached — it is disqualified, like split-off *lulav* leaves. (AH §8)

**If the leaves were split** and divided along most of their length in the majority of the leaves — it is disqualified. (AH §8; Maggid Mishneh and Magen Avraham)[6]

**If it is merely wilted, or a minority of leaves fell off** — it is *kosher bedieved*. (AH §8)

**Leaves are considered "dried out"** when they turn white, as with a *hadas*; one does not go by the fingernail-crumbling test. (AH §8)

- Especially with the large-leaved willows, which dry out within a day and crumble quickly, one cannot rely on the fingernail test but goes by the change of color to white. (AH §8)

**When inserting the willows into the lulav holder,** one must take care not to strip off the leaves along the majority of the required length. (AH §8)

### Notes

**1.** see *Mishnah Berurah* 2, that any color not actually white counts as red, but the *Pri Megadim* requires all three *simanim* and disqualifies if one is missing.

**2.** see *Mishnah Berurah* 3, that some hold it is better *lechatchilah* to take those grown by the stream, though the Taz implies one need not be particular.

**3.** see *Mishnah Berurah* 8, warning that leaves commonly fall off through insertion into the *lulav* and *n*ענוע — especially with a community *lulav* — so on the first day one should appoint someone to watch this.

**4.** see *Mishnah Berurah* 10, that a severed top disqualifies only when the wood is severed, not merely the leaves, and per the Ritva a dried or top-severed *aravah* is *pasul* all seven days since its name is no longer upon it.

**5.** see *Mishnah Berurah* 11, that *lechatchilah* one should not take such an *aravah*, though the *Eliyahu Rabbah* permits it even *lechatchilah* — and since willows are readily available it is best to be *machmir*.

**6.** see *Mishnah Berurah* 9, that per the *Maggid Mishneh* leaves that dangle, split, or divide count as *nifretzu* and are *pasul*, and the *Magen Avraham* rules stringently since willows are readily available.

# סִימָן תרמח

# Siman 648: The Laws of the Esrog: Definition, Validity, and Disqualifications

**§1** **"פְּרִי עֵץ הָדָר" – זֶה אֶתְרוֹג,** — **"The fruit of a beautiful tree" — this refers to the esrog,** and the Sages derive this identification as follows: **דִּ"פְרִי עֵץ" מַשְׁמַע שֶׁטַּעַם עֵצוֹ וּפִרְיוֹ שָׁוֶה,** — **for "the fruit of a tree" implies that the taste of its wood and its fruit are the same, and this is the case with the esrog.** Additionally, there is another derivation: **וְכֵן דָּרְשִׁינַן: "פְּרִי עֵץ הָדָר" – הָדָר בְּאִילָנוֹ מִשָּׁנָה לְשָׁנָה,** — **And similarly we expound: "the fruit of a beautiful tree" — [a fruit] that dwells (hadar) on its tree from year to year,** meaning it remains on the tree for an extended period, **מְשׁוּם דְּהָאֶתְרוֹג מִתְקַיֵּים עַל הָאִילָן שְׁתַּיִם וְשָׁלֹשׁ שָׁנִים.** — **because the esrog remains on the tree for two or three years.** **וּכְשֶׁחוֹנְטִין חֲדָשִׁים – עֲדַיִין הַיְשָׁנִים קַיְימִים.** — **And when the new ones begin to bud, the old ones are still present.** However, beyond these derivations: **וּלְבַד זֶה כָּךְ בָּא אֵלֵינוּ בְּקַבָּלָה מִפִּי מֹשֶׁה רַבֵּינוּ שֶׁכָּךְ קִיבֵּל מִסִּינַי.** — **And besides this, it has come to us through tradition from Moshe Rabbeinu, who received it thus at Sinai.** One may ask why the Torah did not simply state this explicitly: **וְהַטַּעַם שֶׁהַתּוֹרָה פֵּירְשָׁה כָּל הַמִּינִים, וּבְאֶתְרוֹג סָתְמָה –** — **The reason the Torah specified all the other species explicitly, but regarding the esrog was vague** — is in order to teach us an important principle: **כְּדֵי שֶׁנִּצְטָרֵךְ לִסְמוֹךְ עַל תּוֹרָה שֶׁבְּעַל פֶּה.** — **so that we would need to rely upon the Oral Torah.** This demonstrates a fundamental concept: **לְהַרְאוֹת לָנוּ שֶׁאֵין בַּתּוֹרָה שֶׁבִּכְתָב שׁוּם מִצְוָה מְפוֹרֶשֶׁת, וְהַתּוֹרָה שֶׁבְּעַל פֶּה מְבָאֶרָה.** — **to show us that there is no mitzvah in the Written Torah that is fully explicit, and the Oral Torah elucidates it.** A parallel example illustrates this principle: **כְּמוֹ שֶׁבֵּאַרְנוּ זֶה בְּחוֹשֶׁן מִשְׁפָּט סִימָן תכ גַּבֵּי עַיִן תַּחַת עַיִן,** — **As we explained in Choshen Mishpat, Siman 420, regarding "an eye for an eye,"** where the Written Torah's literal meaning is clarified by the Oral tradition, **דְּהַתּוֹרָה שֶׁבְּעַל פֶּה נוֹתֶנֶת רוּחַ חַיִּים בַּתּוֹרָה שֶׁבִּכְתָב.** — **that the Oral Torah gives the breath of life to the Written Torah.** **עַיֵּין שָׁם בְּסָעִיף ח.** — **See there in Seif 8.**

**§2** **אֶתְרוֹג הַיָּבֵשׁ – פָּסוּל.** — **An esrog that is dried out is invalid.** The *Tur* discusses how to determine this: **וְכָתַב הַטּוּר: (שִׁיעוּר הַיְּבָשׁוּת – פֵּירֵשׁ הָרַאב"ד שֶׁזֶּהוּ כְּשֶׁתִּכְלֶה הַלֵּיחָה, וְאֵינוֹ מוֹצִיא שׁוּם לֵיחָה.** — **And the Tur wrote: (The measure of dryness — the Raavad explained that this is when the moisture has been depleted, and it does not exude any moisture.** He explains the significance of this: **כִּי הַלֵּיחָה לְפֵירָא כְּמוֹ הַדָּם לְבָשָׂר הַחַי, שֶׁכָּל זְמַן שֶׁהוּא לַח – יוֹצִיא לֵיחָה, אוֹ מִדּוֹחַק הַסַּכִּין אוֹ מִסְּחִיטָתוֹ.** — **For moisture to a fruit is like blood to living flesh,** and therefore: **so as long as it is moist, it will exude moisture, either from the pressure of a knife or from squeezing it.** **אֲבָל לְאַחַר שֶׁיָּבֵשׁ – לֹא יוֹצִיא לֵיחָה,** — **But after it has dried out, it will not exude moisture,** however there is a practical

difficulty: אֶלָּא שֶׁהַבְּדִיקָה שָׁלוֹ קָשָׁה, לְפִי שֶׁאִי אֶפְשָׁר לְסוֹחֲטוֹ אוֹ לְחָתְכוֹ. — **but checking it is difficult, because one cannot squeeze it or cut it.** The Raavad therefore suggests a method: אֲבָל כֵּיוָן שֶׁנֶּקֶב שֶׁאֵין בּוֹ חֶסְרוֹן – כָּשֵׁר, יָכוֹל לְהַעֲבִיר בּוֹ מַחַט אוֹ חוּט, וְאִם יֵשׁ בּוֹ לֵיחָה – יֵרָאֶה: בַּחוּט.) — **But since a hole that does not diminish it is valid,** one may use this to check: **one can pass a needle or thread through it, and if there is moisture in it, it will be visible on the thread.)** עַד כָּאן לְשׁוֹנוֹ, וְזֶהוּ לְהָרַאב"ד. — **Thus far his words, and this is according to the Raavad.** However, we follow a different ruling: אֲבָל אֲנַן קַיְימָא לַן לוֹמַר דְּנֶקֶב מֵעֵבֶר לְעֵבֶר – פָּסוּל גַּם בְּלֹא חֶסְרוֹן. — **But we hold that a hole that goes from side to side invalidates [the esrog] even without any diminishment.** Therefore, one must be careful when checking: וְאִם כֵּן צָרִיךְ לִיזָּהֵר דְּהַמַּחַט אוֹ הַחוּט לֹא יַעֲבוֹר אֲפִילּוּ עַד חַדְרֵי הַזֶּרַע, וְכָל שֶׁכֵּן מֵעֵבֶר לְעֵבֶר. — **And if so, one must be careful that the needle or thread does not pass even to the seed compartments, and certainly not from side to side.** For the rule is: דְּאַף עַד חַדְרֵי הַזֶּרַע – פָּסוּל, כְּמוֹ שֶׁיִּתְבָּאֵר (ב"ח וט"ז סעיף קטן א). — **for even [a hole reaching] to the seed compartments invalidates [the esrog], as will be explained (Bach and Taz, Seif Katan 1).** וְלָכֵן לֹא יִתְחוֹב הַמַּחַט בְּחָזְקָה, כְּדֵי שֶׁלֹּא יַגִּיעַ לְחַדְרֵי הַזֶּרַע (מגן אברהם סעיף קטן א). — **Therefore, one should not insert the needle forcefully, so that it does not reach the seed compartments (Magen Avraham, Seif Katan 1).**

### Halachic Divergences & Insights

**How to Check Whether an Esrog Is Moist**

***Shulchan Aruch HaRav (Section 1):*** **SAH:** Puncture the esrog with a needle and thread. If the esrog is moist, the moisture will be visible on the thread.

Take care that the needle does not reach the seed compartments or pass through the other side of the esrog. To limit how deeply the needle enters, use one whose eye is near its point but whose shaft continues above the eye.

**§3** וְכָתַב רַבֵּינוּ הָרמ"א בְּסָעִיף א דְּאֶתְרוֹג שֶׁהוּא מִשָּׁנָה שֶׁעָבְרָה – וַדַּאי יָבֵשׁ הוּא, וּפָסוּל. — **And the Rema wrote in Seif 1 that an esrog from the previous year is certainly dried out, and invalid.** עַד כָּאן לְשׁוֹנוֹ. — **Thus far his words.** This implies an important principle: וּמַשְׁמַע לְהֶדְיָא דְּלָא מְהַנֵּי בְּדִיקָה דְּמַחַט, וַאֲפִילּוּ מוֹצִיא לֵיחָה – פָּסוּל. — **And it clearly implies that the needle test does not help, and even if it exudes moisture, it is invalid.** The source for this is: דִּבְגְמָרָא (לא ב) מַשְׁמַע דְּלָא חֲזֵי הָדָר, — **for in the Gemara (31b) it implies that it is not considered "beautiful" (hadar),** as the Gemara teaches: דְּתַנְיָא: אֶתְרוֹג הַיָּשָׁן – פָּסוּל. וְסָתָם "יָשָׁן" הוּא מִשָּׁנָה שֶׁעָבְרָה. וּמְפָרֵשׁ טַעְמָא דְּלָא חֲזֵי הָדָר, עַיֵּין שָׁם. — **for it was taught in a Baraisa: An old esrog is invalid. And an unspecified "old" means from the previous year. And it explains the reason is that it is not considered "beautiful," see there.** Alternatively: אוֹ אֶפְשָׁר לוֹמַר דִּקְיִם לְהוּ לַחֲכָמֵינוּ ז"ל שֶׁכְּלָה הַלֵּיחָה שֶׁלּוֹ, וְאַף אִם יִתְרָאֶה לֵיחָה – אֵין זֶה כְּלוּם. — **Or it is possible to say that our Sages of blessed memory established that its moisture has been depleted, and even if**

**moisture appears, it is of no consequence. וְכֵן הִסְכִּימוּ הַגְּדוֹלִים (ב"ח ואליהו רבה).** — **And so agreed the great authorities (Bach and Eliyahu Rabbah).** However, there is a dissenting view: **וְיֵשׁ מִי שֶׁרוֹצֶה לוֹמַר דְּאִם אָנוּ רוֹאִים שֶׁנִּשְׁאָר בָּנוּי שֶׁלּוֹ – מְהַנֵּי בְּדִיקַת חוּט (ט"ז סעיף קטן ב).** — **And there is one who wishes to say that if we see that its beauty remains, the thread test helps (Taz, Seif Katan 2).** But this view is rejected: **וְלֹא נָהִירָא, כֵּיוָן דַּחֲכָמֵינוּ ז"ל פְּסָלוּהוּ – חֲוֵי פְּסוּל בְּכָל עִנְיָן (אליהו רבה).** — **But this is not correct, since our Sages of blessed memory invalidated it, it is invalid in all circumstances (Eliyahu Rabbah).**

## Halachic Divergences & Insights

**Status of Last Year's Esrog**

***Shulchan Aruch HaRav (Section 2):*** **SAH:** States clearly: 'An esrog over which one recited a blessing during the previous year need not be checked, for it will certainly be found to be dried out.'

## Halachic Divergences & Insights

**Esrogim held in cold storage or frozen**

***Shaar HaTziyun 648 sk 8; Piskei Teshuvos 648:2; Igros Moshe OC 1:185:*** Whereas the *Aruch HaShulchan* treats last year's esrog as certainly dried out, the *Shaar HaTziyun* (sk 8) reports validating an esrog more than a full year off the tree that had been sealed from the air in a metal vessel and kept in a cold, damp place, after the thread test showed it had not shriveled.

From this it is concluded that esrogim kept in cold storage, now routine for many fruits, may be used even though they are from the previous year, provided they look normal and still hold moisture, and provided they were stored under refrigeration and not soaked in water (*Piskei Teshuvos* 648:2).

Fruit that was frozen is another matter. **R' Moshe Feinstein** rules stringently: such fruit keeps its normal appearance for only a few days after it is taken out of the freezer and then rots entirely, which shows that the freezing itself changed the fruit, so it should not be used even before the spoiling appears (*Igros Moshe* OC 1:185).

**§4 וְיֵשׁ שֶׁטּוֹמְנִין הָאֶתְרוֹג בִּדְבַשׁ, דְּהַדְּבַשׁ מְקַיֵּים הַלַּחְלוּחִית שֶׁבּוֹ.** — **And there are those who preserve the esrog in honey, for the honey maintains the moisture within it.** However, this does not automatically make it valid: **וּמִכָּל מָקוֹם בְּלֹא בְּדִיקָה אִי אֶפְשָׁר לְהַכְשִׁירוֹ. וְיִבָּדְקֶנּוּ: אִם יֵשׁ בּוֹ לֵיחָה – כָּשֵׁר (ב"ח).** — **Nevertheless, without checking, one cannot validate it. And one should check it: if there is moisture in it, it is valid (Bach).** How-

ever, there is a dissenting view: **וְיֵשׁ מִי שֶׁפּוֹסְלוֹ מִטַּעַם כָּבוּשׁ (ט"ז סעיף קטן יז),** — **And there is one who invalidates it because of "pickling" (Taz, Seif Katan 17),** and this is based on the principle that: **וְכָבוּשׁ פָּסוּל כְּמוֹ שֶׁיִּתְבָּאֵר.** — **and a pickled [esrog] is invalid, as will be explained.** The first opinion responds to this concern: **וְדֵיעָה רִאשׁוֹנָה סוֹבֶרֶת:** כֵּיוָן דְּהַדְּבַשׁ מְקַיְּימוֹ בְּלַחְלוּחִיתוֹ, כְּמוֹ שֶׁאָנוּ רוֹאִים בְּכָל הַפֵּירוֹת – **לֹא שַׁיָּיךְ** כָּבוּשׁ לְעִנְיַן מִצְוָה (וְכֵן מַשְׁמַע בְּאֵלִיָּהוּ רַבָּה). — **And the first opinion holds: since the honey maintains its moisture, as we see with all fruits — the concept of "pickling" does not apply regarding the mitzvah (and so it implies in the Eliyahu Rabbah).** However, in practice: **מִיהוּ לְמַעֲשֶׂה קָשֶׁה לִסְמוֹךְ עַל זֶה.** — **However, in practice, it is difficult to rely on this.** There is another preservation method: **וְכֵן שָׁמַעְתִּי שֶׁכְּשֶׁטּוֹמְנִין אוֹתוֹ בְּשַׁעֲוָה, וּמַדְבִּיקִין אוֹתוֹ סָבִיב סָבִיב בְּשַׁעֲוָה – מִתְקַיֵּים הַרְבֵּה, וְגַם זֶה אֵין לִסְמוֹךְ לְמַעֲשֶׂה.** — **And similarly I have heard that when they embed it in wax, and seal it all around with wax, it is preserved for a long time, and this too should not be relied upon in practice.**

### Halachic Divergences & Insights

**When an Esrog Is Considered Pickled**

***Shulchan Aruch HaRav (Section 25):*** **SAH:** An esrog is considered pickled if it was soaked for 24 hours in water, fruit juice, or another liquid. This applies even if it was soaked in honey, although honey tends to preserve food. The ruling appears to follow the *Taz*'s stringent view rather than the *Bach*'s lenient view cited by the *Aruch HaShulchan*.

**§5 וְאַף עַל גַּב דְּיָבֵשׁ – פָּסוּל, מִכָּל מָקוֹם כָּמוּשׁ שֶׁקּוֹרִין "צו ווייאלע"ט" – כָּשֵׁר, כְּמוֹ בִּשְׁאָרֵי מִינִים.** — **And even though a dried [esrog] is invalid, nevertheless a withered one — which they call in Yiddish "tzu veyalet" — is valid, as with the other species.** This has explicit Talmudic support: **וְכֵן הוּא לְהֶדְיָא בִּגְמָרָא (לא א) שֶׁאוֹמֵר: וְכוּלָּן כְּמוּשִׁין – כְּשֵׁרִים.** — **And so it states explicitly in the Gemara (31a) which says: And all of them [the Four Species], when withered, are valid.** This raises a question about certain sources: **וּלְפִי זֶה מַה שֶּׁנִּמְצָא בָּרוֹקֵחַ וּבְתְשׁוּבַת מהרי"ל דְּכָמוּשׁ פָּסוּל – הוּא דָּבָר תְּמֵהַּ.** — **And according to this, what is found in the Rokeach and in the responsa of the Maharil that a withered [esrog] is invalid — is quite puzzling.** **וּבְמָרְדְּכַי כָּתוּב שֶׁכָּשֵׁר בִּשְׁעַת הַדְּחַק.** — **And in the Mordechai it is written that it is valid in a pressing situation.** The *Beis Yosef* addresses this discrepancy: **וְגַם בָּזֶה כָּתַב רַבֵּינוּ הַבַּיִת יוֹסֵף בְּסִפְרוֹ הַגָּדוֹל סוֹף סִימָן תרמט דְּהוּא טָעוּת הַדְּפוּס, וְצָרִיךְ לוֹמַר "כָּבוּשׁ", עַיֵּין שָׁם.** — **And regarding this too, our master the Beis Yosef wrote in his great work at the end of Siman 649 that it is a printing error, and it should read "pickled" (kavush), see there.** However, the *Aruch HaShulchan* offers another explanation: **וְנִרְאֶה דְּאֵלּוּ דְּפַסְלֵי כָּמוּשׁ – כַּוָּונָתָם דְּעַל יְדֵי הַכְּמִישָׁה נִתְיַבֵּשׁ מִקְצָתוֹ גַּם כֵּן.** — **And it appears that those who invalidate a withered [esrog] — their intent is that through the withering, part of it has also become dried out.** Support for

this interpretation: **וְכֵן מַשְׁמַע בְּהַגָּהוֹת אַשְׁרִי, שֶׁהִתְחִיל בְּכָמוּשׁ וְסִיֵּם בְּיָבֵשׁ (מגן אברהם ריש הסימן).** — **And so it implies in the Hagahos Ashri, who began [discussing] a withered [esrog] and concluded [discussing] a dried one (Magen Avraham, beginning of this Siman).** However, there is another textual variant: **אָמְנָם בְּבה"ג הֵבִיא הַבְּרַיְיתָא (לו א):** — **However, in the Behag he cites the Baraisa (36a): An esrog that is swollen, putrid, pickled, cooked, etc. — is invalid.** And in the Behag's version: **אֶתְרוֹג תָּפוּחַ, סָרוּחַ, כָּבוּשׁ, שָׁלוּק וכו' – פָּסוּל.** — **And in the Behag it reads "withered" (kamush) and not "pickled" (kavush).** According to this reading: **וּבבה"ג אִיתָא "כָּמוּשׁ" וְלֹא "כָּבוּשׁ".** — **And according to this, we must say that the ruling that withered ones are valid — applies to all [species] except the esrog.** **וּלְפִי** זֶה צָרִיךְ לוֹמַר דְּהָא דִּכְמוּשִׁין כְּשֵׁרִים – הֵם לְבַד הָאֶתְרוֹג. — **And it is clear that this is the textual reading of the Rokeach and the Maharil.** **וּבָרוּר הוּא שֶׁזֶּהוּ גִּירְסַת הָרוֹקֵחַ וְהַמהרי"ל. וּלְפִי** זֶה פְּשִׁיטָא דְּכָמוּשׁ פָּסוּל, **וְכֵן יֵשׁ לְהוֹרוֹת.** — **And according to this, it is obvious that a withered [esrog] is invalid, and so should one rule.** **(וְכֵן כָּתַב הָאֵלִיָּהוּ רַבָּה, עַיֵּין שָׁם.)** — **(And so wrote the Eliyahu Rabbah, see there.)**

### Halachic Divergences & Insights

**Whether a Withered Esrog Is Valid**

***Mishnah Berurah (Sk. 2) / Shulchan Aruch HaRav (Section 1):*** **MB:** A withered esrog is valid even if completely withered, because it still contains some moisture. However, following the *Magen Avraham*, it must be checked with a needle and thread.

**SAH:** A withered esrog is valid, with no requirement to check it. Both authorities are lenient, unlike the *Aruch HaShulchan*, who follows the Behag's reading and invalidates a withered esrog.

**§6** **כָּתַב הָרמב"ם בְּפֶרֶק שְׁמִינִי דִּין ז:** — **The Rambam wrote in Chapter Eight, Halachah 7:** where he records the following ruling regarding holes in an esrog: **(אֶתְרוֹג שֶׁנִּיקַּב נֶקֶב מְפוּלָּשׁ כָּל שֶׁהוּא – פָּסוּל.** — **"An esrog that has a hole perforated through and through, of any size — is invalid.** **וְשֶׁאֵינוֹ מְפוּלָּשׁ, אִם הָיָה כְּאִיסָּר אוֹ יוֹתֵר – פָּסוּל.** — **And if it is not perforated through, if it was the size of an isar or more — it is invalid.** **חָסֵר כָּל שֶׁהוּא – פָּסוּל.) עַד כָּאן לְשׁוֹנוֹ,** — **If it is lacking any amount — it is invalid." Thus far his words.** The *Aruch HaShulchan* now explains the Rambam's meaning: **כְּלוֹמַר: דְּנֶקֶב שֶׁיֵּשׁ בּוֹ חֶסְרוֹן, וְהַחֶסְרוֹן מֵעֶצֶם בְּשַׂר הָאֶתְרוֹג, אֲפִילּוּ אֵינוֹ מְפוּלָּשׁ – פָּסוּל.** — **That is to say: a hole that has a deficit, and the deficit is from the actual flesh of the esrog, even if it is not perforated through — it is invalid.** **אֲבָל נֶקֶב שֶׁאֵין בּוֹ חֶסְרוֹן, וְהַיְינוּ כְּגוֹן שֶׁנָּעַץ שָׁם יָתֵד וְכַיּוֹצֵא בּוֹ,** — **But a hole that has no deficit — meaning, for example, if a peg or the like was inserted there,** **שֶׁנַּעֲשָׂה הַמָּקוֹם כְּנֶקֶב, וּמִכָּל מָקוֹם לֹא חָסֵר מֵעֶצֶם הָאֶתְרוֹג כְּלוּם** – — **so that the place became like a hole, yet nothing is actually lacking from the substance of**

**the esrog** — in such a case there is a distinction: **יֵשׁ חִילּוּק בֵּין מְפוּלָּשׁ דְּפָסוּל בְּכָל עִנְיָן,** — **there is a distinction between a perforated hole, which is invalid in all circumstances, וּבְאֵינוֹ מְפוּלָּשׁ צָרִיךְ כְּאִיסָּר.** — **and one that is not perforated through, which requires the size of an isar to be invalid.**

## Halachic Divergences & Insights

**Hole Without Substance Loss**

***Shulchan Aruch HaRav (Sections 3-4):*** **SAH:** Clarifies that when a hole lacks none of the esrog's substance (e.g., pierced by a thick peg), it is valid if smaller than an isar. The measurement considers a hypothetical circle that could be made from the hole's area, regardless of shape (round, square, or elongated).

**§7 ? "וּמַה נִּקְרָא "מְפוּלָּשׁ** — **And what is called "perforated through"?** There are different opinions: **יֵשׁ אוֹמְרִים דַּוְקָא מֵעֵבֶר לְעֵבֶר.** — **Some say specifically from one side to the other side.** i.e., the hole must go completely through the esrog. **וְיֵשׁ אוֹמְרִים דְּוַדַּאי לְמַטָּה בְּתַחְתִּיתוֹ, שֶׁכָּלוּ שָׁם חַדְרֵי הַזֶּרַע – צָרִיךְ מֵעֵבֶר לְעֵבֶר.** — **And some say that certainly at the bottom, in its base, where the seed chambers end — it requires penetration from one side to the other. אֲבָל בְּכָל הָאֶתְרוֹג, כְּשֶׁנִּיקַּב עַד חַדְרֵי הַזֶּרַע – מִקְרֵי מְפוּלָּשׁ, דְּזֶהוּ פִּילּוּשׁוֹ.** — **But throughout the rest of the esrog, when it is perforated until the seed chambers — it is called perforated, for this is its perforation.** The *Aruch HaShulchan* now explains the anatomical structure of the esrog: **וְדַע שֶׁיֵּשׁ בְּהָאֶתְרוֹג עַד חַדְרֵי הַזֶּרַע שָׁלֹשׁ קְלִיפּוֹת:** — **And know that in the esrog, until the seed chambers, there are three layers: הָאַחַת הָעֶלְיוֹנָה שֶׁהִיא דַּקָּה מְאֹד, וְהוּא כְּמִין גְּלִיד,** — **The first is the upper one, which is very thin, and it is like a type of skin, וּבוֹ אֵין שׁוּם פְּסוּל אֶלָּא אִם כֵּן נִגְלַד כּוּלּוֹ.** — **and regarding it there is no disqualification unless it is entirely peeled off. וְעַל קְלִיפָּה זוֹ כָּתַב הָרַמְב"ם פֶּרֶק אֶחָד עָשָׂר, דִּתְרוּמוֹת לְעִנְיַן אֶתְרוֹגֵי תְּרוּמָה,** — **And regarding this rind the Rambam wrote in Chapter Eleven of Terumos, concerning esrogim of terumah, דְּקִלְיפֵיהֶן אַף עַל פִּי שֶׁמַּשְׁלִיכִין אוֹתָם מִכָּל – מָקוֹם אֲסוּרִים לְזָרִים, עַיֵּין שָׁם.** — **that their rinds, even though they are discarded, are nevertheless forbidden to non-Kohanim, see there. דְּזֶהוּ כִּקְלִיפָּה דַּקָּה שֶׁבְּכָל הַפֵּירוֹת.** — **For this is like the thin peel found on all fruits.** Now the second layer: **וְהַשֵּׁנִית הִיא הַקְּלִיפָּה הָעָבָה, שֶׁהוּא כָּל דּוֹפֶן הָאֶתְרוֹג עַד חַדְרֵי הַזֶּרַע.** — **And the second is the thick rind, which is the entire wall of the esrog until the seed chambers. וְגַם זֶה נִקְרָא "קְלִיפָּה", כְּמוֹ שֶׁכָּל עוֹבִי הַקּוֹרְקְבָן נִקְרָא "עוֹר",** — **And this too is called "rind," just as the entire thickness of the gizzard is called "skin," אַף עַל פִּי שֶׁזֶּהוּ עִיקַּר אֲכִילָתוֹ.** — **even though this is the main edible part. וְהָכָא נָמֵי בְּאֶתְרוֹג כֵּן, דְּעִיקַּר הַפֵּירִי הֵם חַדְרֵי הַזֶּרַע, וְהַבָּשָׂר שֶׁעָלָיו נִקְרָא קְלִיפָּה.** — **And here too with the esrog it is the same, for the main fruit is the seed chambers, and the flesh upon it is called rind. וּבוֹ הוּא שִׁיעוּר הַנְּקָבִים שֶׁנִּתְבָּאֲרוּ.** — **And regarding it apply the measurements of holes that were explained.** Now the third layer: **וְהַשְּׁלִישִׁית: יֵשׁ מַמָּשׁ**